

Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research

Mailing Address: 1818 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20433, U.S.A.

Office Location: 801 19th Street, N.W.

Telephone (Area Code 202) 334-8021

Cable Address—INTBAFRAD

From: The Secretariat

MT88/018

March 30, 1988

Consultative Group MeetingMay 16-20, 1988Berlin, Federal Republic of GermanyAgenda Item 10Organization of Future CGIAR MeetingsSummary

This document reviews the various suggestions that have been made for improving the format of the two annual meetings of the CGIAR. It proposes extending the formal centers week meetings over an eight day period to include both an expanded system consultation (including a number of non-associated centers and observers) and a business meeting of the CGIAR. About half of the time would be spent in smaller sessions, meeting in parallel two at a time, and half in plenary sessions.

For the mid-term meeting, it is proposed that in addition to members of the Group, the only participants would be a limited number of representatives of TAC and the CGIAR secretariat, the chairs of center directors and board chairs, and representatives of those centers with items on the agenda.

Several alternatives are described, and issues for decision are set forth on pages 10 and 11.

Distribution

CGIAR members
Center board chairpersons
Center directors
TAC chairman
TAC members
TAC secretariat
Observers

..2/..

In requesting the secretariat to propose a new shape for the meetings of the Group, members seemed to have a number of complaints or problems in mind. These are listed below, and possible remedies identified.

Problem 1: The agenda focusses too narrowly on the affairs of the 13 centers supported by the Group. It should seek wider participation of those with something to contribute, include general information on issues related to agricultural research, and should provide an opportunity for outside research organizations, particularly international ones, to present their ideas to the broader community, not merely their own donors.

Possible answers:

(a) Invite a broader spectrum of people (including representatives of non-associated centers) to participate in a part of one meeting a year, centers week, and open a substantial portion of the program to them.

(b) Organize more presentations and discussions of topics of general interest, like the gender seminar at ICW87. Examples might include: a briefing on the present state of the law of property rights related to agricultural research in both developed and developing countries, covering the competing systems of industrial patents and plant breeders rights and their possible implications for international centers and national systems; a presentation of evolving information technologies and their implications for the conduct of agricultural research.

(c) Put time on the agenda for presentations by non-associated centers similar to those made by CGIAR supported centers every other year.

Problem 2: The sessions of the Group, already long, still do not allow enough time for participants to follow up on their interests. The presentations take too much of the available time; discussions tend to consist of a single round of comments followed by a chairman's summary, even on very complex and controversial issues. The pressure of time inhibits worthwhile discussions which would interest some members.

Possible answer: Hold smaller separate meetings with voluntary attendance which would give those interested the opportunity of going in depth into questions of interest.

Problem 3: The number of items concerning individual centers, whether for information (presentations) or other purposes (program approvals, external reviews) require many delegates to sit through presentations and discussions on centers in which they have no particular interest.

Possible answer: Have individual center questions discussed in separate meetings with voluntary attendance. Conclusions could be reached at these separate meetings, or could be referred to the plenary meeting of the Group for confirmation with limited additional discussion.

Problem 4: With participation of center staffs and boards, TAC members, observers and relatively large member delegations, meetings of the Group are too large for full and frank discussion among the donor representatives.

Possible answers: Have observers excluded from the business meetings of the Group, and restrict center representation to, say, the director and board chairs. Have the mid-term meeting restricted to members only, with only the board chair and the chair of center directors present, plus representatives of those centers with business items on the agenda. Try to postpone such items until ICW so that few individual centers need to be represented.

Problem 5: The meetings of the Group take too much time of the members, and this situation tends to get worse rather than better.

Possible answers: Compress all of the business into a single annual meeting, of possibly greater length; make strict rules that meetings other than those closely connected with the CGIAR will not be held as part of the same schedule as the CGIAR; matters of information only, or of minor import, should be handled on paper only, without bringing them to the floor of the meeting; a body should be designated to make decisions on behalf of the Group between meetings, and the meetings themselves confined to issues of overriding importance.

Clearly, these points do not all lead in the same direction, nor it is possible to propose a single system that satisfies all of the concerns expressed. In the following, one possible compromise is outlined, and some variations suggested to help the Group decide what it wishes to do. No progress has been made toward the goal of restricting the meetings to a single one per year.

It is suggested that ICW become in effect two interwoven meetings, one a conference of a broader international agricultural research system, and the second a business meeting of the CGIAR with more restricted attendance. A good share of the discussions during ICW would be held in parallel sessions two of which would be held simultaneously, so that more material could be covered in smaller groups.

The suggestion for the mid-term meeting is to restrict attendance largely to members of the Group, and encourage members to limit the size of their delegations in order to provide a more intimate atmosphere, and an opportunity for freer and franker discussion.

International Centers Week

The attached materials (Annex 1) show an agenda for a meeting of the expanded system, and one of the CGIAR held in the period from Friday through lunch on the following Friday. Sunday is a free day except for the traditional picnic and some small private meetings, including the

cosponsors. Plenary sessions are generally held in the morning, and smaller, simultaneous meetings in the afternoon. It is assumed that all parallel meetings would be fully open, so that only the plenary business sessions of the CGIAR would have restricted participation.

The expanded systems meeting would include such usual agenda items as the opening address of the chairman of the CGIAR, the report of the TAC chairman, and the talk on implications of world agricultural trends by the director of IFPRI. These have been normal ICW business, but are clearly of interest to the broader agricultural research community. The expanded meeting would also include in depth discussions of topics such as property rights and the implications of information technology, also of broad interest, with enough time allowed for serious information to be provided, and questions asked and answered. Other topics of general interest, such as presentations by centers, would be covered in smaller meetings, held two at a time. This schedule would allow time for the seven CGIAR centers scheduled to make presentations at ICW88 plus four non-associated centers. (Two CGIAR centers, ICRISAT and CIAT, would appear twice in 1988, once to make a presentation, and once to propose a medium-term program for approval. Thought might be given to combining these two appearances into one longer one, and making room for one or two additional non-associated centers to make presentations.)

Among the parallel meetings, some are labelled "Information" and are not designed to lead to action or conclusions. Others are labelled "Working" and represent preliminary discussions of topics that also come to the floor of the CGIAR plenary session for debate of difficult points and final conclusions. It would be expected that there would be no general presentation of such a topic in the plenary session. The chairman of the working meeting would summarize the discussion, and the areas of consensus reached, and propose only unresolved points for debate and conclusion in the plenary session. In addition to the topics covered by working meetings, a number of other matters are taken up directly and without preliminary in the CGIAR plenary meetings.

(The specific items on the agenda should be taken as illustrative only. Many things may change between this writing and ICW, and no attempt has been made to craft the timing with the care which would ultimately be necessary. The same comment applies even more forcefully to the later illustration of a possible outline for the Canberra meeting in May 1989.)

Implications

The meeting can succeed in this framework only if members come prepared to make choices among topics, or with large enough delegations to cover all sessions of interest. Some will be required to choose among alternatives, the regional representatives for example, and perhaps share notes or impressions. While the number of days devoted to Group meetings would expand, it should still be possible to fit the entire set of meetings within a two week period (that is TAC, center directors, center board

chairs and so forth). Possibly TAC might need to extend a day or so into the previous week. If SPAAR continues to meet just before the CGIAR, it would convene on Wednesday and/or Thursday, overlapping with smaller CGIAR meetings as it does already. The overall time frame of centers week and related activities would probably not change much, but more time would be required for the Group members who do not ordinarily participate in the smaller CGIAR related activities preceeding centers week itself.

It should be noted that inviting non-associated centers to make presentations to the expanded CGIAR system would not necessarily replace their need for separate meetings of their own donors for purposes such as pledging, approving strategies and planning reviews. If held in connection with ICW, such meetings would need to be fitted in either before or after the CGIAR meetings.

The job of chair of the working meetings would be an important one, since it would involve bringing the essence of the working meeting to the floor of the plenary session in a form conducive to a brief and pointed discussion, and setting forth the issues needing further consideration. A number of chair persons would have to be found for the working meetings, and others for the information meetings. In the case of working meetings it would be desirable to have a written document prepared and circulated before the topic comes before the plenary session.

Holding meetings on this format means leaving the Bank/IMF facilities which do not have a room large enough for the expanded system plenary sessions, nor neighboring rooms for the parallel simultaneous sessions. Suitable facilities are available in hotels in Washington. In partial compensation for the change, many of the participants could reside in the hotel where the meetings will be located, increasing opportunities for informal contact. The circular format would no longer be possible, at least for the expanded plenary sessions.

The cost of the meeting will increase somewhat because of the longer time, the need for outside facilities, and the increase in services that would be needed. The expense would not be so great, however, that it should be a decisive factor.

In short, this would be a large change, and one that would perhaps appear greater than it is because of the shift in venue. It would present a difficult, but perhaps not impossible, challenge: to retain the informal and friendly atmosphere of CGIAR meetings in unaccustomed surroundings.

Alternatives and Issues

Pattern of smaller meetings: Some have suggested that the "working meeting" concept is too big a risk. Rather than discuss a topic twice, and risk repetition in the plenary session of the same material covered in the working meeting, it is suggested that all business topics requiring Group action should be handled entirely in CGIAR plenary

sessions. This could be done within the same time-frame by extending the plenaries into the afternoons and adding half of the time allowed for the working meeting on each topic to the plenary discussion of the same topic. Thus the ICARDA external reviews would have a total of two and a half hours of plenary time, instead of three hours of working meeting, plus an hour of plenary time. A further alternative would be to try the working meeting concept on a few subjects as an experiment, but not as extensively as proposed in the schedule.

Others propose that all single center matters be covered in parallel sessions exclusively, and not brought to the Group in plenary. Such matters as approval of a medium-term program for a center, and drawing conclusions from external reviews, would then not come to the full Group at all, which will seem inappropriate to many.

One suggestion that deserves consideration would be to have center presentations four at a time, and have them last for a whole morning or whole afternoon. This approach, if applied to both CGIAR-supported and non-associated centers, would consume the same number of hours as the two-at-a-time idea, but would produce more intimate meetings with center leadership, and a chance to pursue questions on the minds of donors and others in considerable detail, not offered by the present proposal.

Records of the meetings: At present, an unedited verbatim transcript of CGIAR meetings is available in microfiche form on request. The CG secretariat puts out a document entitled "Major Conclusions and Recommendations" which summarizes the discussions and the consensus reached. This document does not cover in any detail the material presented for information only; separate documents or publications usually provide what is required here.

Is some additional form of record needed, particularly for sessions held in parallel? Possibilities include video tapes, which would be practical for the presentation parts of meetings, but not for ensuing discussion. Videos would have the advantage of showing the visual elements which are an important part of many presentations. They would, however, be expensive, largely because of the need to transform them into the various formats in current use. An alternative which would be livelier than a transcript would be audio tapes, which could be copied cheaply from the tape used for the verbatim record. Members views on this question may provide a basis for measuring the potential demand for audio or video tapes.

Interpretation: Simultaneous interpretation would continue in the plenary sessions. Would it be required in any of the parallel, smaller meetings? The suggested answer is that it not be provided, but that interpreters be offered to groups of people in any one meeting who require assistance in working in English. One interpreter would work with a small group of persons with the same language capability to help them follow the discussion. Short speeches in French and Spanish would be allowed, with consecutive translation.

Participation in the expanded system: Who should be invited to take part in the plenary meetings of the expanded system and observe the open parallel meetings of the CGIAR system? First which centers should be placed on the list to make presentations along with those supported by the CGIAR. A simple approach would be to select only institutions:

- organized basically on the lines of CG-supported centers, i.e. with a self-perpetuating board of trustees, and possessing an international personality;
- conducting research programs themselves in the same or related fields, providing support services to such, or otherwise judged by TAC to be relevant to CGIAR purposes; and
- supported principally by donors who are members of the CGIAR.

The first criterion might exclude some governmentally controlled centers with a good deal to offer. The requirement of an independent board might be relaxed for this informational purpose.

The second issue concerns the institutions not meeting the above criteria or individuals who should be invited as observers to participate in the expanded system meetings. The present list of observers, which has grown through ad hoc decisions, is attached for information (Annex 2). There are some fairly obvious points:

- institutions currently actively collaborating with the CGIAR in program development should be invited, e.g. Winrock (vegetables), CIRAD (West African maize and cassava), and IICA (sharing responsibility with certain national systems);
- agencies which contribute to centers but are not formally members of the Group;
- potential donors should be invited at an appropriate stage of their consideration of joining;
- aside from these categories, national institutions should not be invited, although they can participate as adjuncts to the delegations of their governments; and
- individuals should be dropped from the list, except on special occasions (but in some cases should be kept currently informed of the work of the Group because of the likelihood that they will once again play important roles in the future).

Beyond this, things get difficult. Reference books suggest that there are probably between 70 and 100 international agencies of one kind and another that could legitimately claim a close relationship with

agricultural research, and the number would grow if one added closely related fields such as environment, forestry, and climatology. Obviously size, reputation, and ability to contribute substantively need to be taken into account. Probably the best we can do is to proceed cautiously, and keep the responsibility in the hands of very wise people. If a small committee on meetings is established, as suggested later in this paper, it might deal with suggestions or requests for observer status. Such status should be for a limited period, subject to review and renewal.

It has been the practice recently to invite any organization which held a donor group meeting connected with a CGIAR meeting to send two observers to that CGIAR meeting. This practice might be continued for ICW, so long as donor meetings are sponsored by CGIAR donor members.

Possible ways of shortening the meeting: One obvious way would be to reverse the inclination to expand the substantive range of, and participation in, centers week. Otherwise there are a number of possibilities. The more work is done in parallel meetings, and the less in plenary, the shorter elapsed time is necessary for a given amount of business. Perhaps some meetings could be held three at a time instead of two at a time. Information programs of some length, such as that on property rights, or information technology, could be taken off the plenary agenda and held in parallel. The participants could work on Sunday and save half a day.

A way of saving time for some participants, though not for all, would be to group items of lesser import, or requiring no action, at the beginning of the meeting time, so that leaders of delegations could come late. This idea is often attached to the suggestion of having all of the individual center presentations grouped at the start of the time period. A philosophy of grouping important questions and decisions towards the end of the eight-day period would produce a very different pattern, with the plenary sessions coming mostly in the last several days, and full days of smaller meetings at the beginning. What has been proposed was in fact designed to spread the plenary sessions and matters of particular interest over the whole period, to avoid too great intensity and fatigue.

Some of the items on the agenda, perhaps TAC's proposals to use quantitative models for planning, could be handled entirely through the distribution of papers without any need for discussion. It might help if the members of the Group were able to identify items which they would be content to have dealt with in this way.

Mid-Term Meeting

There seems to be a substantial body of opinion among the donors that the mid-term meeting should be much smaller and in fact restricted to what is defined above as the CGIAR proper. This format should be tried out at Canberra, and if it works well, confirmed as the normal approach. A tentative listing of the work to be done in May 1989 shows a requirement

for three days of meetings (if all in plenary) or perhaps two and a half days if a substantial amount is done in parallel sessions (Annex 3).

In order to restore the intimate feeling of some of the earlier mid-term meetings, we might experiment with a rule that no donor should bring more than two participants. An exception might be made for the host country, which could be allowed five out of courtesy. If all members were present (very unlikely) the total number of donor participants would be 84. With ten regional representatives, and perhaps another 16 in total for the representatives of the center directors and board chairs, TAC, the two secretariats, and individuals required for specific subjects, the maximum in the room would be 110, less than half of the number recently present at ICW. This implies inviting no observers at all to the mid-term meetings, and no center representation unless there is an item on the agenda (such as an external review) specifically requiring a center to be present.

Australia has been good enough to say that it wants to host in 1989 the kind of meeting the Group wants to have. Subject to confirmation at Berlin, the Group seems to want a restricted session as described. This would not rule out additional meetings specifically concerned with Australian scientific research and the CGIAR. Center staff would have to be specifically invited for those other meetings, but that seems quite likely that they would consider the journey worthwhile for the interaction with Australian science alone.

When not themselves hosting meetings, donor representatives seem to hope that the host country will use the occasion to publicize the work of the centers (and host country collaboration with centers) to its own public, rather than to rehearse the strengths of its research system for other donors. It would be interesting if Australia could build a program along these lines. Were the Australian portion of the program requiring donor presence to be confined to half a day, the Canberra meeting might require Group members to be present for only three and a half days. Having parallel working meetings might not be practical if donor delegations are to be kept small, as suggested.

The implications of having a SPAAR meeting immediately before or after the Canberra session of the CGIAR would have to be faced separately.

If any meetings of support groups for non-associated centers were held in Canberra, anyone travelling specially for those meetings would not for that reason alone be invited to observe the CGIAR meetings. It would remain to be seen whether this would discourage the holding of such support group meetings.

Issues and Alternatives

Is the mid-term meeting required at all? It is hard this far away from mid-1989 to judge the urgency of the items on the agenda for Canberra. Those which can be seen to have schedule implications are all related to

specific centers. If the IRRI strategy is complete and TAC recommendations are in hand in time for this discussion, IRRI will wish to have any remaining uncertainties out of the way so that it can prepare a medium-term program beginning in 1990 for approval at ICW89. CIMMYT's external reviews are scheduled for July and August 1988, but because there is no TAC meeting before October cannot come to ICW88. To delay action until the end of 1989 could leave matters in limbo for a rather long time, particularly if there should be outstanding issues between TAC and the CIMMYT board. Were consideration of the medium-term programs for ICRISAT and ICARDA to be held over until ICW89, both centers would have to assume that the Group would approve TAC's recommendations without change, as a basis for preparing their 1990 fund requests. As things stand there seem to be fairly strong arguments for holding the meeting, and dealing with these four items, bringing four center teams to Canberra for that purpose.

Other business from TAC is likely to involve the approach taken by the Group to presently non-associated centers; once TAC has made recommendations on such points, the Group will probably want to make its decisions rather than waiting for half a year.

Apart from establishing an interim decision-making body to function between meetings, which is not considered in this paper, the only way to remove the need for mid-term meetings would seem to be to structure the entire work schedule to prepare issues for Group consideration at the end of the year. It would seem possible to rework review schedules so that the products would be ready for the Group in the fall, and few would have to wait many months for Group action. This would probably require rescheduling TAC sessions. One difficulty would be approving medium-term program proposals more than a year before they are scheduled to go into effect. It would be useful to test donor opinion at Berlin whether a serious effort should be made over a period of two or three years to eliminate the need for the mid-term meeting.

Points for Decision

A. ICW

1. Should the meeting be expanded in participation, and in the range of topics covered, at the cost of a longer schedule?
2. Should information sessions take place in smaller groups, two at a time?
3. Should there be a substantial number, a few, or no working meetings, providing for preliminary discussion of complex questions requiring Group decisions prior to an abbreviated consideration in plenary session? The alternative would be for all CGIAR business subjects to be handled in the full meeting.
4. Is simultaneous translation into French and Spanish required for smaller, simultaneous meetings?

5. Is there a demand for video tapes of presentations made to simultaneous meetings, or for audio tapes of the whole of such meetings?

6. What criteria should apply to invitations to non-associated centers to make presentations, or to other institutions or individuals to participate in expanded sessions as observers?

7. In general, is the pattern of ICW as described acceptable, or are there substantial changes to be made?

B. Mid-term Meeting

1. Is the general pattern of a short, small mid-term meeting acceptable?

2. Is there support for limiting host country presentations to members of the Group to half a day?

3. Does the Group wish a serious exploration and proposals of changes in the system that could reduce the need for meetings of the whole to one per year?

The secretariat has benefitted from a lot of advice in preparing this paper, and has consulted quite broadly. It was not possible to accept all suggestions, but those made have all contributed to the clarification of thought and hopefully of presentation. It might be useful to the secretariat in implementing these changes, preparing the detailed agenda, and otherwise planning for meetings of the Group, if there were a small group of experienced Group members who could be consulted from time to time, through the mail or by telephone, about steps proposed. Such a committee might include three donors, one regional representative, and one person drawn from each of center management, boards, and TAC.

Agenda for ICW88 Meetings

Expanded system plenary meetings

Chairman's opening remarks (0.5 hrs)
TAC chairman's report (1.5 hrs)
World agricultural trends & their implications for international
research (J. Mellor) (1.5 hrs)
Briefing on property rights (3.5 hrs)
Seminar on information technology (2 hrs)

Information meetings

7 CGIAR center presentations (1.5 hrs each)
4 non-associated center presentations (1.5 hrs each)
Overview of center management (3 hrs)
IDB funding study (1.5 hrs)
Use of quantitative models in priority setting (1.5 hrs)

CG system topics covered in working meetings and later in plenary sessions

Working meeting (hours)		Plenary (hours)
1.5 each	Presentations and subsequent approval of medium-term programs of 4 centers	1.0
3.0	ICARDA EPR/EMR reviews	1.0
3.0	Aquaculture proposals	1.0
1.5	Review systems in the CGIAR	1.0
1.5	Examination of the CG secretariat	1.0
1.5	TAC recommendations on genetic resources policy	1.0
3.0	TAC papers on center relations with NARS and other centers	1.0

Other topics covered in CG plenary session

Report of the chair of center directors (0.75 hr)
Report of the chair of board chairpersons (0.75 hr)
Approval of 1989 budgets (0.5 hrs)
Pledging session (1 hr)
Report of pledging (0.5 hrs)
Future meetings (0.5 hrs)
Other topics, e.g. Africa, IBPGR
Other business (1 hr)
Chairman's concluding remarks (0.5 hrs)

Outline Program for Centers Week 1988

SCHEDULE

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 28

0900-1300 Expanded system plenary

- Chairman's opening remarks (0.5 hrs)
- TAC chairman's report (1.5 hrs)
- World agricultural trends and their implications for international research (J. Mellor) (1.5 hrs)

1430-1800 working meeting

Presentation and approval of medium-term programs--two centers (3 hrs)

1430-1800 working meeting

EPR/EMR ICARDA (3 hrs)

Evening: Heads of delegation dinner

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 29

0900-1300 Expanded system plenary

Briefing on property rights (3.5 hrs)

1430-1800 working meeting

Presentation and approval of medium-term programs--two centers (3 hrs)

1430-1800 working meeting

Aquaculture proposals (3 hrs)

Evening: Free

SUNDAY, OCTOBER 30

Afternoon: Center directors' picnic

Evening: Co-sponsors' meeting

MONDAY, OCTOBER 31

0900-1100 Expanded system plenary

Seminar on information technology (2 hrs)

1130-1300 information meeting

Center presentation (1.5 hrs)

1430-1800 working meetings

- Review systems in the CGIAR (1.5 hrs)
- Examination of the CG secretariat (1.5 hrs)

1130-1300 information meeting

Center presentation (1.5 hrs)

1430-1800 working meetings

TAC papers on center relations with NARS and other centers (3 hrs)

Evening: Sir John Crawford Lecture & King Baudoin Award

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 1

0900-1300 CG plenary meeting

- Approval of medium-term programs of 4 centers (1 hr)
- ICARDA EPR/EMR reviews (1 hr)
- Aquaculture proposals (1 hr)

1430-1800 information meetings

Two center presentations (3 hrs)

1430-1800 information meetings

Two center presentations (3 hrs)

Evening: Dinner hosted by Mr. Conable

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 2

0900-1300 CG plenary meeting

- Report of chair of center directors (0.75 hr)
- Report of chair of board chairpersons (0.75 hr)
- Review systems in the CGIAR (1 hr)
- Examination of the CG secretariat (1 hr)

1430-1800 information meetings

Overview of center management (3 hrs)

1430-1800 information meetings

Two center presentations (3 hrs)

Evening: Chairman's reception

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 3

0900-1300 CG plenary meeting

- Genetic resources policy (2 hrs)
- Approval of 1989 budgets (0.5 hrs)
- Pledging session (1 hr)

1430-1800 information meetings

- IDB funding study (1.5 hrs)
- Use of quantitative models in priority setting (1.5 hrs)

1430-1800 information meetings

Two center presentations (3 hrs)

Evening: Free

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 4

0900-1330 CG plenary meeting

- TAC papers on center relations with NARS and other centers (1 hr)
- Report of pledging (0.5 hrs)
- Future meetings (0.5 hrs)
- Other specific matters (1 hr)
- Other business (0.5 hr)
- Chairman's concluding remarks (0.5 hrs)

FUTURE MEETINGS

Observers/Other Participants

Combined list for all meetings since May 1986

The list omits persons making presentations or otherwise participating in the programs.

Research institutions:

AVRDC
CARDI
CATIE
IBSRAM
ICIPE
ICLARM
ICRAF
IFDC
IIMI
INIBAP
INTSOY
IUFRO

Other:

ACP/EEC Technical Center, Convention of Lome
CASAFA
CAB International
CIRAD
Crawford lecturer
DAC, OECD, Paris
ICRA
IICA
Near East Foundation
New Zealand
Winrock International
World Food Council

FUTURE MEETINGS

Planning Document for Canberra, May 1989

The following is a comparison of the schedule of business meetings of the CGIAR for Canberra as it would look under the current format compared with a combination of working meetings and plenary sessions.

	Current system	Combination Working meeting	Plenary session
	-----hours-----		
Chairman's opening remarks	0.5		0.5
TAC chairman's report	1.5		1.5
IRRI review completion	2.0	2.0	1.0
Review and approval of medium-term programs (ICARDA, ICRISAT)	4.0	3.0	1.0
CIMMYT EPR/EMR reviews	3.0	3.0	1.0
TAC proposal on ...	2.0	2.0	1.0
TAC report on non-associated centers	2.0	2.0	1.0
Biotechnology & agricultural development *	1.5	2.0	0.0
Future meetings	0.5		0.5
Continuing items (Africa reports, IBPGR, Sustainability, or others)	2.0		2.0
Other business	1.0		1.0
Total Hours	<u>20.0</u>	<u>14.0</u>	<u>10.5</u>

This indicates that under the current (i.e. Berlin) procedure, the Group would need three days of plenary meetings at seven hours per day.

A combination of working meetings and plenary sessions, would result in fourteen hours of working meetings (one day), plus ten hours (about one-and-a-half days) for plenary sessions.

* Results of a study by ACIAR for the World Bank.